

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet of drawings includes Figure 17. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: New Drawing Sheet showing Figure 17

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 8 are now pending in the application. Claim 9 has been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification as originally filed. Examples of the support can be found on Page 1, Lines 9 – 14 and Page 18, Lines 4 – 9. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections and the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW**

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Karabi Guharay for the courtesies extended during a telephonic interview on June 26, 2006 with Applicants' Attorney of record, Joshua B. Dobrowitsky. The drawing objections, the independent claim and the rejections and references of record were discussed but no formal agreements were reached.

### **DRAWINGS**

The drawings stand objected to for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicants have attached a new drawing sheet for the Examiner's approval. Figure 17 shows the circular fluorescent lamp having a nonlinear discharge path as described in the specification as originally filed and, therefore, no new matter has been

added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection in view of the enclosed drawing amendment.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103**

Claims 1, 3, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fu et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,287,993). Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fu et al. and further in view of Mori et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,459,197). Claims 6 – 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juestel et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0027420) and further in view of Fu et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

While the Office Action appears to have identified portions of the Fu reference that disclose overlapping ranges of the phosphor adhesive glass composite expressed by  $x\text{SiO}_2 \cdot y\text{B}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot a\text{ZnO} \cdot b\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot c\text{MgO} \cdot m\text{XO}$ , as set forth in the claims, the Office Action's reliance on Fu appears to be misplaced.

As best understood by Applicants, Fu only discloses a composition for glass and glass-ceramics and not a composite layer adhered to glass. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not met the procedural burdens under §§ 102 and 103 because Fu does not teach or suggest a phosphor adhesive glass composite as originally claimed.

Furthermore, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to further define the invention and facilitate prosecution. As such, Applicants claim, in part, a phosphor and a phosphor adhesive glass composite dispersed into the phosphor to adhere. Fu does not teach or suggest a composite that is applied to glass to, among other things, help adhere the

phosphor to the glass. Fu does disclose a glass matrix. But, the glass matrix has no such layers that adhere to one another, as the phosphorescent qualities in Fu are contained in the matrix and not in a separate layer. Fu, therefore, cannot serve to anticipate or render obvious the invention as claimed. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 1. Claims 2 – 8 depend on Claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the above reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is always invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-0750, under Order No. 5077-000206/US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: July 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joshua B. Dobrowitsky  
Registration No.: 51,288  
HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600  
Attorney for Applicant